arXiv:quant-ph/0411035v1 4 Nov 2004

k-DECOMPOSABILITY OF POSITIVE MAPS

WŁADYSŁAW A. MAJEWSKI AND MARCIN MARCINIAK

1. Introduction

For any C^*-algebra A let A^+ denote the set of all positive elements in A. A *state* on a unital C^*-algebra A is a linear functional $\omega : A \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\omega(a) \geq 0$ for every $a \in A^+$ and $\omega(\mathbb{I}) = 1$ where $\mathbb{I}$ is the unit of A. By $\mathcal{S}(A)$ we will denote the set of all states on A. For any Hilbert space H we denote by $\mathcal{B}(H)$ the set of all bounded linear operators on H.

A linear map $\varphi : A \to B$ between C^*-algebras is called *positive* if $\varphi(A^+) \subset B^+$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider a map $\varphi_k : M_k(A) \to M_k(B)$ where $M_k(A)$ and $M_k(B)$ are the algebras of $k \times k$ matrices with coefficients from A and B respectively, and $\varphi_k([a_{ij}]) = [\varphi(a_{ij})]$. We say that φ is *k-positive* if the map φ_k is positive. The map φ is said to be *completely positive* when it is k-positive for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

A *Jordan morphism* between C^*-algebras A and B is a linear map $\rho : A \to B$ which respects the Jordan structures of algebras A and B, i.e. $\rho(ab + ba) = \rho(a)\rho(b) + \rho(b)\rho(a)$ for every $a, b \in A$. Let us recall that every Jordan morphism is a positive map but it need not be a completely positive one (in fact it need not even be 2-positive). It is commonly known ([21]) that every Jordan morphism $\rho : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ is a sum of a *-morphism and a *-antimorphism.

The Stinespring theorem states that every completely positive map $\varphi : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ has the form $\varphi(a) = W^*\pi(a)W$, where π is a *-representation of A on some Hilbert space K, and W is a bounded operator from H to K.

Following Størmer ([20]) we say that a map $\varphi : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ is *decomposable* if there are a Hilbert space K, a Jordan morphism $\rho : A \to \mathcal{B}(K)$, and a bounded linear operator W from H to K such that $\varphi(a) = W^*\rho(a)W$ for every $a \in A$.

By $B(H) \ni b \mapsto b^t \in B(H)$ we denote the transposition map (for details see Section 2). We say that a linear map $\varphi : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ is *k-copositive* (resp. *completely copositive*) if the map $a \mapsto \varphi(a)^{\mathrm{t}}$ is k-positive (resp. *completely positive*). The following theorem ([22]) characterizes decomposable maps in the spirit of Stinespring's theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\varphi : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a linear map. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *φ is decomposable;*
2. *for every natural number k and for every matrix $[a_{ij}] \in M_k(A)$ such that both $[a_{ij}]$ and $[a_{ji}]$ belong to $M_k(A)^+$ the matrix $[\varphi(a_{ij})]$ is in $M_k(\mathcal{B}(H))^+$;*
3. *there are maps $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ such that φ_1 is completely positive and φ_2 completely copositive, with $\varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$.*

The classification of decomposable maps is still not complete even in the case when A and H are finite dimensional, i.e. $A = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^m)$ and $H = \mathbb{C}^n$. The most

---

Supported by RTN HPRN-CT-2002-00279.

important step was done by Størmer ([22]), Choi ([4, 5]) and Woronowicz ([24]). Størmer and Woronowicz proved that if $m = n = 2$ or $m = 2$, $n = 3$ then every positive map is decomposable. The first examples of nondecomposable maps was given by Choi (in the case $m = n = 3$) and Woronowicz (in the case $m = 2$, $n = 4$). It seems that very general positive maps (so not of the CP class) and hence possibly non-decomposable ones, are crucial for an analysis of nontrivial quantum correlations, i.e. for an analysis of genuine quantum maps ([23, 19, 7, 14, 15, 16]). Having that motivation in mind in our last paper ([10]) we presented a step toward a canonical prescription for the construction of decomposable and non-decomposable maps. Namely, we studied the notion of k-decomposability and proved an analog of Theorem 1.1. Moreover it turned out that it is possible to describe the notion of k-decomposabilty in the dual picture. More precisely, the analog of Tomita-Takesaki construction for the transposition map on the algebra $B(H)$ can be formulated (Section 2). Application of this scheme provides us with a new characterization of decomposability on the Hilbert space level (see Section 3). Thus, it can be said that we are using the equivalence of the Schrödinger and Heisenberg pictures in the sense of Kadison ([8]), Connes ([6]) and Alfsen, Shultz ([1]). Section 4 provides a detailed exposition of two dimensional case and establishes the relation between Størmer construction of local decomposability and decomposability fo distinguished subsets of positive maps.

2. Tomita-Takesaki scheme for transposition

Let H be a finite dimensional (say n-dimensional) Hilbert space. Define $\omega \in \mathcal{B}(H)^*_{+,1}$ as $\omega(a) = \mathrm{Tr}\varrho a$, where ϱ is an invertible density matrix, i.e. the state ω is a faithful one. Denote by (H_π, π, Ω) the GNS triple associated with $(\mathcal{B}(H), \omega)$. Then, one can identify the Hilbert space H_π with $\mathcal{B}(H)$ where the inner product $(\cdot\,,\cdot)$ defined as $(a, b) = \mathrm{Tr} a^* b$ for $a, b \in \mathcal{B}(H)$. With the above identification one has $\Omega = \varrho^{1/2}$ and $\pi(a)\Omega = a\Omega$ for $a \in B(H)$. In this setting one can simply express the modular conjugation J_{m} as the hermitian involution, i.e. $J_{\mathrm{m}} a\varrho^{1/2} = \varrho^{1/2}a^*$ for $a \in B(H)$. Similarly, the modular operator Δ is equal to the map $\varrho \cdot \varrho^{-1}$;

Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ be the orthonormal basis of H consisted of eigenvectors of ϱ. Then we can define

$$J_c f = \sum_i \overline{\langle x_i, f\rangle} x_i \tag{2.1}$$

for every $f \in H$. The map J_c is a conjugation on H. So, we can define the transposition on $\mathcal{B}(H)$ as the map $a \mapsto a^t \equiv J_c a^* J_c$ where $a \in \mathcal{B}(H)$. By τ we will denote the map induced on H_π by the transposition, i.e.

$$\tau a\varrho^{1/2} = a^t \varrho^{1/2} \tag{2.2}$$

where $a \in \mathcal{B}(H)$.

Let $E_{ij} = |x_i\rangle\langle x_j|$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$. Obviously, $\{E_{ij}\}$ is an orthonormal basis in H_π. Hence, similarly to (2.1) one can can define a conjugation J on H_π

$$J a\varrho^{1/2} = \sum_{ij} \overline{(E_{ij}, a\varrho^{1/2})} E_{ij} \tag{2.3}$$

where $a \in B(H)$. We have the following

Proposition 2.1. *Let $a \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $\xi \in H_\pi$. Then*

$$a^t\xi = Ja^*J\xi.$$

Now, define the unitary operator U on H_π by

$$U = \sum_{ij} |E_{ji}\rangle\langle E_{ij}| \tag{2.4}$$

Clearly, $UE_{ij} = E_{ji}$. The properties of U, introduced above conjugation J and modular conjugation J_m is are described by

Proposition 2.2. *One has:*

1. *$U^2 = \mathbb{I}$ and $U = U^*$*
2. *$J = UJ_{\mathrm{m}}$;*
3. *J, J_{m} and U mutually commute;*
4. *J commutes with the modular operator Δ.*

The following theorem justifies using the term "Tomita-Takesaki scheme" for transposition

Theorem 2.3. *If τ is the map introduced in (2.2), then*

$$\tau = U\Delta^{1/2}.$$

Moreover one has the following properties:

1. *$U\Delta = \Delta^{-1}U$;*
2. *If α is the automorphism of $B(H_\pi)$ implemented by U, i.e. $\alpha(x) = UxU^*$ for $x \in B(H_\pi)$, then α maps $\pi(B(H))$ onto its commutant $\pi(B(H))'$;*
3. *If V_β denotes the cone $\overline{\{\Delta^\beta a\varrho^{1/2} : a \in B(H)^+\}} \subset H_\pi$ (cf. [2]) for each $\beta \in [0, 1/2]$ then U maps V_β onto $V_{(1/2)-\beta}$. In particular, the natural cone $\mathcal{P} = V_{1/4}$ is invariant with respect to U.*

Corollary 2.4. *$U\Delta^{1/2}$ maps V_0 into itself.*

Summarizing, this section establishes a close relationship between the Tomita-Takesaki scheme and transposition. Moreover, we have the following :

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\xi \mapsto \omega_\xi$ be the homeomorphism ([6, 3]) between the natural cone $\mathcal{P}$ and the set of normal states on $\pi(\mathcal{B}(H))$ such that*

$$\omega_\xi(a) = (\xi, a\xi), \quad a \in \mathcal{B}(H).$$

For every state ω define $\omega^\tau(a) = \omega(a^t)$ where $a \in \mathcal{B}(H)$. If $\xi \in \mathcal{P}$ then the unique vector in $\mathcal{P}$ mapped into the state ω^τ_ξ by the homeomorphism described above, is equal to $U\xi$

In the sequel, we will need the following construction: Suppose that we have a C^*-algebra A equipped with a faithful state ω_A and consider the tensor product $A \otimes B(H)$, where H is the same as above. Then $\omega_A \otimes \omega$ is a faithful state on $A \otimes B(H)$. So, we can perform GNS constructions for both (A, ω_A) and $(A \otimes B(H), \omega_A \otimes \omega)$ and obtain representations (H_A, π_A, Ω_A) and $(H_\otimes, \pi_\otimes, \Omega_\otimes)$ respectively. We observe that we can make the following identifications:

1. $H_\otimes = H_A \otimes H_\pi$,
2. $\pi_\otimes = \pi_A \otimes \pi$,
3. $\Omega_\otimes = \Omega_A \otimes \Omega$

where (H_π, π, Ω) is the GNS triple described in the begining of this section. With these identifications we have $J_\otimes = J_A \otimes J_m$ and $\Delta_\otimes = \Delta_A \otimes \Delta$ where $J_\otimes$, J_A, J_m are modular conjugations and $\Delta_\otimes$, Δ_A, Δ are modular operators for $(\pi_\otimes(A \otimes B(H))'', \Omega_\otimes)$, $(\pi_A(A)'', \Omega_A)$, $(\pi(B(H))'', \Omega)$ respectively. Since Ω_A and Ω are separating vectors, we will write $a\Omega_A$ and $b\Omega$ instead of $\pi_A(a)\Omega_A$ and $\pi(b)\Omega$ for $a \in A$ and $b \in B(H)$.

The natural cone ([3, 2]) $\mathcal{P}_\otimes$ for $(\pi_\otimes(A \otimes B(H))'', \Omega_\otimes)$ is defined as the closure of the set

$$\left\{ \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k \otimes b_k \right) j_\otimes \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m} a_l \otimes b_l \right) \Omega_\otimes : \begin{array}{l} m \in \mathbb{N} \\ a_1, \ldots, a_m \in A \\ b_1, \ldots, b_m \in B(H) \end{array} \right\}$$

where $j_\otimes(\cdot) = J_\otimes \cdot J_\otimes$ is the modular morphism on $\pi_\otimes(A \otimes B(H))'' = \pi_A(A)'' \otimes \pi(B(H))''$.

Motivated by Proposition 2.5 we introduce the "transposed cone" $\mathcal{P}_\otimes^\tau = (\mathbb{I} \otimes U)\mathcal{P}_\otimes$ where U is the unitary defined in (2.4). Elements of this cone are in 1-1 correspondence with the set of partial transpositions $\phi \circ (\mathrm{id} \otimes t)$ for all states ϕ on $A \otimes B(H)$. It can be easily calculated that we have the following

Theorem 2.6. *The transposed cone $\mathcal{P}_\otimes^\tau$ is the closure of the set*

$$\left\{ \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k \otimes \alpha(b_k) \right) j_\otimes \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m} a_l \otimes \alpha(b_l) \right) \Omega_\otimes : \begin{array}{l} m \in \mathbb{N} \\ a_1, \ldots, a_m \in A \\ b_1, \ldots, b_m \in B(H) \end{array} \right\}$$

where α is the automorphism introduced in Theorem 2.3(2).

Consequently, $\mathcal{P}_\otimes^\tau = \mathcal{P}_\otimes'$ where $\mathcal{P}_\otimes'$ is the natural cone for $(\pi_A(A) \otimes \pi(B(H))', \omega_\otimes)$.

3. k-DECOMPOSABILITY AT THE HILBERT-SPACE LEVEL

Let A be a unital C^*-algebra, H be a Hilbert space and let $\varphi : A \longrightarrow B(H)$ be a linear map. We introduce ([10]) the notion of k-decomposability of the map φ was studied.

Definition 3.1. (1) We say that φ is *k-decomposable* if there are maps $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ such that φ_1 is k-positive, φ_2 is k-copositive and $\varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$.

(2) We say that φ is *weakly k-decomposable* if there is a C^*-algebra E, a unital Jordan morphism $\rho : A \to E$, and a positive map $\psi : E \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ such that $\psi|_{\rho(A)}$ is k-positive and $\varphi = \psi \circ \rho$.

The connection between k-decomposability, weak k-decomposability and the Størmer condition ([20]) is the following

Theorem 3.2. *For any linear map $\varphi : A \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ consider the following conditions:*

(D_k) *φ is k-decomposable;*
(W_k) *φ is weakly k-decomposable;*
(S_k) *for every matrix $[a_{ij}] \in M_k(A)$ such that both $[a_{ij}]$ and $[a_{ji}]$ are in $M_k(A)^+$ the matrix $[\varphi(a_{ij})]$ is positive in $M_k(\mathcal{B}(H))$;*

Then we have the following implications: $(\mathrm{D}_k) \Rightarrow (\mathrm{W}_k) \Leftrightarrow (\mathrm{S}_k)$.

The results of Section 2 strongly suggest that a more complete theory of k-decomposable maps may be obtained in Hilbert-space terms. To examine that question we will study the description of positivity in the dual approach to that given in in the above theorem, i.e. we will be concerned with the approach on the Hilbert space level.

Let us resrict to the case $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ where $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{B}(H_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a concrete von Neumann algebra with a cyclic and separating vector $\Omega_{\mathcal{M}}$. When used, $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ will denote the vector state $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot) = (\Omega_{\mathcal{M}}, \cdot\Omega_{\mathcal{M}})$. The natural cone (modular operator) associated with $(\mathcal{M}, \Omega_{\mathcal{M}})$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ ($\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ respectively).

We assume that that φ satisfy Detailed Balance II ([18]), i.e. there is a positive unital map φ^{β} such that $\omega(a^*\varphi(b)) = \omega(\varphi^{\beta}(a^*)b)$ for $a, b \in \mathcal{M}$. In this case φ induces a bounded operator T_{φ} on $H_{\omega_{\mathcal{M}}}$ which commutes strongly with $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ and satisfies $T_{\varphi}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}) \subset \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Let $B(\mathbb{C}^n) \ni a \mapsto a^t \in B(\mathbb{C}^n)$ denotes the usual transposition map on the algebra of $n \times n$-matrices. Let ω be a faithful state on $B(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and let $\mathcal{P}_n$ denote the natural cone for $(\mathcal{M} \otimes B(\mathbb{C}^n), \omega_{\mathcal{M}} \otimes \omega)$. From Theorem 3.2 it follows that to develop the theory of decomposability on the Hilbert space level we should examine the action of the map $\mathbb{I} \otimes T_{\varphi}$ on the transposed cone $\mathcal{P}_n^{\tau} = (\mathbb{I} \otimes U)\mathcal{P}_n$ described in the previous section, where the operator U on $B(\mathbb{C}^n)$ was introduced in the previous section (for some orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}$ of eigenvectors of ϱ_{ω_0}). It can be deduced from Proposition 2.5.26 in the book of Bratteli and Robinson ([3]) and the results of previous section that the cones $\mathcal{P}_n$ and $\mathcal{P}_n^{\tau}$ have the following forms:

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \overline{\Delta_n^{1/4}\{[a_{ij}]\Omega_n : [a_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathcal{M})^+\}},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_n^{\tau} = \overline{\Delta_n^{1/4}\{[a_{ji}]\Omega_n : [a_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathcal{M})^+\}}.$$

It turns out that the adaptation of Lemma 4.10 in the paper of Majewski ([12]) leads to the following characterization of k-positivity and k-copositivity

Lemma 3.3. *The map $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is k-positive (k-copositive) if and only if $(T_{\varphi} \otimes \mathbb{I})^*(\mathcal{P}_n) \subset \mathcal{P}_n$ (respectively $(T_{\varphi} \otimes \mathbb{I})^*(\mathcal{P}_n) \subset \mathcal{P}_n^{\tau}$) for every $n = 1, \ldots, k$.*

By $\overline{co}(\mathcal{T})$ we denote the closed convex hall of the subset $\mathcal{T}$. Now, we are in position to give promised result.

Theorem 3.4. *Consider the following two conditions on φ:*

1. *φ is weakly k-decomposable;*
2. *$(T_{\varphi} \otimes \mathbb{I})^*(\mathcal{P}_n) \subset \overline{co}(\mathcal{P}_n \cup \mathcal{P}_n^{\tau})$ for every $n = 1, \ldots, k$.*

Then, in general, the property (2) implies (1). If, in addition, the cone $\mathcal{P}_n \cap \mathcal{P}_n^{\tau}$ is equal to the closure of the set

$$\{\Delta_n^{1/4}[a_{ij}]\Omega_n : [a_{ij}], [a_{ji}] \in M_n(\mathcal{M})^+\}$$

then (2) follows from (1).

In particular in the finite-dimensional case the two conditions are equivalent.

Remark 3.5. It can be easily showed that $\overline{co}(\mathcal{P}_n \cup \mathcal{P}_n^{\tau})$ and $\mathcal{P}_n \cap \mathcal{P}_n^{\tau}$ are dual cones. It is still an open question whether the equality

$$\overline{\{\Delta_n^{1/4}[a_{ij}]\Omega_n : [a_{ij}], [a_{ji}] \in M_n(\mathcal{M})^+\}} = \mathcal{P}_n \cap \mathcal{P}_n^{\tau}$$

holds in general.

4. Application of local decomposability to low dimensional cases

In this section we indicate how the discussed techniques relied on decomposition may be used for a characterization of linear positive unital maps $\varphi : M_m(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow M_n(\mathbb{C})$ in the case of low dimensions m and n.

Størmer ([20]) proved that each positive map $\varphi : M_m(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is locally decomposable, i.e. for every non-zero vector $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ there exist a Hilbert space K_η, a linear map V_η on K_η into $\mathbb{C}^n$, such that $\|V_\eta\| \leq M$ for all η, and a Jordan *-homomorphism ρ_η of $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\varphi(a)\eta = V_\eta \rho_\eta(a) V_\eta^* \eta \tag{4.1}$$

for all $a \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$. For the readers convenience we remind the construction of Størmer in details. Given a vector $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^m$, $\|\eta\| = 1$, we consider the state ω_η on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ defined as

$$\omega_\eta(a) = \langle \eta, \varphi(a)\eta \rangle, \quad a \in M_n(\mathbb{C}). \tag{4.2}$$

Let $\mathcal{L} = \{a \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) : \omega_\eta(a^*a) = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{a \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) : \omega_\eta(aa^*) = 0\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{L}$ is a left ideal in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ while $\mathcal{R}$ is a right ideal. By K_l and K_r we denote the quotient spaces $M_n(\mathbb{C})/\mathcal{L}$ and $M_n(\mathbb{C})/\mathcal{R}$ respectively. For any $a \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ we write $[a]_l$ and $[a]_r$ the abstract classes of a in K_l and K_r respectively. Next, let $K_\eta = K_l \oplus K_r$ and define the scalar product $\langle\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\rangle$ on K_η

$$\langle\langle [a_1]_l \oplus [a_2]_r, [b_1]_l \oplus [b_2]_r \rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\omega_\eta(a_1^* b_1) + \frac{1}{2}\omega_\eta(b_2 a_2^*). \tag{4.3}$$

For simplicity we will write $[a]$ instead of $[a]_l \oplus [a]_r$ for $a \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$. By G we denote the subspace of K_η consisted of every such elements and by G' its orthogonal complement. Finally, V_η and ρ_η are given by

$$\rho(a)\left([b_1]_l \oplus [b_2]_r\right) = [ab_1]_l \oplus [b_2 a]_r, \quad a, b_1, b_2 \in M_n(\mathbb{C}); \tag{4.4}$$

$$V_\eta k = \begin{cases} \varphi(a)\eta, & \text{if } k = [a] \text{ for some } a \in M_n(\mathbb{C}), \\ 0, & \text{if } k \in G'. \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

The crucial point in our considerations is the characterization of face structure of the set of unital positive maps between matrix algebras which was done by Kye ([9]). Recall that if C is a convex set then a convex subset $F \subset C$ is called a face if for any $x, y \in C$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ the following implication holds:

$$\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y \in F \quad \Rightarrow \quad x, y \in F.$$

Kye proved that any maximal face of the set of unital positive maps from $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ into $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is of the following form

$$F_{\xi,\eta} = \{\varphi : \varphi(\mathbb{I}) = \mathbb{I}, \, \varphi(|\xi\rangle\langle\xi|)\eta = 0\} \tag{4.6}$$

for some $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

In the sequel we describe the case $m = n = 2$. As we mentioned in the introduction, Størmer ([20]) proved that every positive map $\varphi : M_2(\mathbb{C}) \to M_2(\mathbb{C})$ is (globaly!) decomposable. The next proposition indicates the relationship between this phenomenon and the notion of local decomposability for φ in a maximal face. We need the following notations. If ξ and η are arbitrary unit vectors in $\mathbb{C}^2$ then let ξ_1, ξ_2 be an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $\xi_1 = \xi$ and similarly η_1, η_2 be a basis such that $\eta_1 = \eta$. By e_{ij} we denote the operator $|\xi_i\rangle\langle\xi_j|$ for $i, j = 1, 2$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose* $\varphi \in F_{\xi,\eta}$. *Let* K_η, V_η *and* ρ_η *be as in (4.1). Then*

$$\varphi(a) = V_\eta \rho_\eta(a) V_\eta^*, \quad a \in M_2(\mathbb{C}). \tag{4.7}$$

if and only if

$$\mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{12}) = \mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{21}) = 0, \quad \mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{22}) = 1, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{11}) = 2\left(|\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_1\rangle|^2 + |\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_1\rangle|^2\right). \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. From the definition (4.6) of $F_{\xi,\eta}$ it follows that the projection e_{11} is an element of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{R}$. On the other hand both $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ are proper ideals in $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ because φ is unital. Consequently $\mathcal{L} = M_2(\mathbb{C})e_{11}$ and $\mathcal{R} = e_{11}M_2(\mathbb{C})$ and the Hilbert space $K = M_2(\mathbb{C})/M_2(\mathbb{C})e_{11} \oplus M_2(\mathbb{C})/e_{11}M_2(\mathbb{C})$ is four dimensional. By direct computations it can be checked that the elements

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &= \sqrt{2}[e_{12}] = \sqrt{2}[e_{12}]_l + \sqrt{2}[e_{12}]_r \\ k_2 &= \sqrt{2}[e_{21}] = \sqrt{2}[e_{21}]_l + \sqrt{2}[e_{21}]_r \\ k_3 &= [e_{22}] = [e_{22}]_l + [e_{22}]_r \\ k_4 &= [e_{22}]_l - [e_{22}]_r \end{aligned}$$

form an orthonormal basis in K. Moreover, from (4.5) and (4.6) we get the following equalities

$$V_\eta k_1 = \sqrt{2}\varphi(e_{12})\eta_1 = \sqrt{2}\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_1\rangle \eta_1 + \sqrt{2}\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_1\rangle \eta_2 = \alpha\eta_2$$

where $\alpha = \sqrt{2}\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_1\rangle$. The last equality is due to the fact that $e_{12} \in e_{11}M_2(\mathbb{C}) \subset \ker \omega_\eta$ (cf. (4.2)). Similarly we check that

$$V_\eta k_2 = \beta \eta_2$$

where $\beta = \sqrt{2}\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_1\rangle$. The definition (4.6) of $F_{\xi,\eta}$ and the fact that φ is unital imply

$$V_\eta k_3 = \varphi(e_{22})\eta_1 = \varphi(\mathbb{I})\eta_1 - \varphi(e_{11})\eta_1 = \eta_1.$$

Finally, from the dafinition (4.5) of V_η and from the fact that k_4 is orthogonal to G it follows that

$$V_\eta k_4 = 0.$$

Hence, the matrix of the operator $V_\eta : K \to \mathbb{C}^2$ in the bases $\{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4\}$ and $\{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$ has the form

$$V_\eta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \alpha & \beta & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.10}$$

In order to prove sufficiency in the statement of the theorem, assume that φ fulfils conditions (4.8) and (4.9). We will show that $\varphi(a) = V_\eta \rho_\eta(a) V_\eta^*$ for any $a \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$. Observe that from local decomposability (4.1) we have

$$\varphi(a)\eta_1 = V_\eta \rho_\eta(a) V_\eta^* \eta_1.$$

So, it remains to prove that

$$\varphi(a)\eta_2 = V_\eta \rho_\eta(a) V_\eta^* \eta_2 \tag{4.11}$$

for every $a \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$. As $\{e_{ij}\}_{i,j=1,2}$ forms a system of matrix units in $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ it is enough to show (4.11) for $a = e_{ij}$ where $i, j = 1, 2$.

Let $a = e_{12}$. Following the assumption and the fact that $e_{12} \in e_{11}M_2(\mathbb{C}) \subset \ker \omega_\eta$ we have

$$0 = \mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{12}) = \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_1 \rangle + \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle = \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle.$$

Hence,

$$\varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 = \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_1 + \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_2 = \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{21}\eta_2 \rangle \eta_1.$$

On the other hand, application of (4.10) and (4.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & V_\eta \rho(e_{12}) V_\eta^* \eta_2 = \\ &= V_\eta \rho(e_{12}) \left(\overline{\alpha} k_1 + \overline{\beta} k_2 \right) \\ &= 2V_\eta \left(\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_2 \rangle \rho_\eta(e_{12})[e_{12}] + \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle \rho_\eta(e_{12})[e_{21}] \right) \\ &= 2\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle V_\eta \left([e_{11}]_l + [e_{22}]_r \right) \\ &= \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle V_\eta \left(k_3 - k_4 \right) \\ &= \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_1 \end{aligned}$$

So, we get $\varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 = V_\eta \rho_\eta(e_{12}) V_\eta^* \eta_2$.

By simillar computations we check that $\varphi(e_{21})\eta_2 = V_\eta \rho(e_{21}) V_\eta^* \eta_2$.

Now, let $a = e_{22}$. We have

$$1 = \mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{22}) = \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{22})\eta_1 \rangle + \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{22})\eta_2 \rangle = 1 + \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{22})\eta_2 \rangle,$$

so $\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{22})\eta_2 \rangle = 0$ and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(e_{22})\eta_2 &= \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{22})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_1 + \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{22})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_2 \\ &= \langle \varphi(e_{22})\eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle = \langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$V_\eta \rho_\eta(e_{22}) V_\eta^* \eta_2 = 2V_\eta \left(\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_2 \rangle [e_{12}]_r + \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle [e_{21}]_l \right) = 0.$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $e_{12} \in e_{11}M_2(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{R}$ and $e_{21} \in M_2(\mathbb{C})e_{11} = \mathcal{L}$.

Finally, let $a = e_{11}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & V_\eta \rho_\eta(e_{11}) V_\eta^* \eta_2 = \\ &= V_\eta \left(2\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_2 \rangle \rho_\eta(e_{11})[e_{12}] + 2\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle \rho_\eta(e_{11})[e_{21}] \right) \\ &= 2\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_2 \rangle V_\eta [e_{12}]_l + 2\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle V_\eta [e_{21}]_r \\ &= \sqrt{2}\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_2 \rangle V_\eta k_1 + \sqrt{2}\langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_2 \rangle V_\eta k_2 \\ &= 2\left(|\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{21})\eta_1 \rangle|^2 + |\langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{12})\eta_1 \rangle|^2 \right) \eta_2. \end{aligned}$$

As $\varphi \in F_{\xi,\eta}$ then

$$\mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{11}) = \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{11})\eta_1 \rangle + \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{11})\eta_2 \rangle = \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{11})\eta_2 \rangle,$$

hence

$$\varphi(e_{11})\eta_2 = \langle \eta_1, \varphi(e_{11})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_1 + \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{11})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_2 = \langle \eta_2, \varphi(e_{11})\eta_2 \rangle \eta_2 = \left[\mathrm{Tr}\varphi(e_{11}) \right] \eta_2.$$

From (4.9) we conclude that $\varphi(e_{11})\eta_2 = V_\eta \rho_\eta(e_{11}) V_\eta^* \eta_2$ and the proof of sufficiency is finished.

It is easy to observe that in order to prove necessity one should repeat the same computations in the converse direction. □

References

[1] E.M. Alfsen and F.W. Shultz, *State spaces of operator algebras*, Birkhauser, Boston, 2001.

[2] H. Araki, Some properties of modular conjugation operator of a von Neumann algebra and a non-commutative Radon-Nikodym theorem with a chain rule, *Pac. J. Math.* **50** (1974), 309–354.

[3] O. Bratteli and D.W. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics I* : Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[4] M.-D. Choi, Completely positive maps on complex matrices, *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **10** (1975), 285–290.

[5] M.-D. Choi, Positive semidefinite biquadratic forms, *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **12** (1975), 95–100.

[6] A. Connes, Charactérisation des espaces vectoriels ordonnés sous-jacents aux algèbres de von Neumann, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble* **24** (1974), 121-155

[7] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions, *Phys. Lett A* **223**, 1-8 (1996)

[8] R. V. Kadison, Transformations of states in operator theory and dynamics, *Topology* **3** (1965) 177-198

[9] S.-H. Kye, Facial structures for the positive linear maps between matrix algebras, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **39**(1) (1996), 74–82.

[10] L. E. Labuschagne, W. A. Majewski and M. Marciniak, On k-decomposability of positive maps, preprint, `math-ph/0306017`.

[11] L. E. Labuschagne, W. A. Majewski and M. Marciniak, On decomposition of positive maps, in preparation.

[12] W. A. Majewski, Transformations between quantum states, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **8** (1975), 295–307.

[13] W.A. Majewski, Dynamical Semigroups in the Algebraic Formulation of Statistical Mechanics, *Fortschr. Phys.* **32**(1984)1, 89–133.

[14] W. A. Majewski, Separable and entangled states of composite quantum systems; Rigorous description, *Open Systems & Information Dynamics*, **6**, 79-88 (1999).

[15] W. A. Majewski, "Quantum Stochastic Dynamical Semigroup", in *Dynamics of Dissipations*, eds P. Garbaczewski and R. Olkiewicz, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. **597**, pp. 305-316, Springer (2002).

[16] W. A. Majewski, On quantum correlations and positive maps, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **67** (2004), 125–132.

[17] W. A. Majewski and M. Marciniak, On a characterization of positive maps, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34** (2001), 5863–5874.

[18] W. A. Majewski and R. Streater, Detailed balance and quantum dynamical maps, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **31** (1998), 7981–7995.

[19] A. Peres, Separability criterion for density matrices, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **77**, 1413 (1996)

[20] E. Størmer, Positive linear maps of operator algebras, *Acta Math.* **110** (1963), 233–278.

[21] E. Størmer, On the Jordan structure of C^*-algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc* **120** (1965), 438–447.

[22] E. Størmer, Decomposable positive maps on C^*-algebras, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **86** (1982), 402–404.

[23] G. Wittstock, *Ordered Normed Tensor Products* in "Foundations of Quantum Mechanics and Ordered Linear Spaces" (Advanced Study Institute held in Marburg) A. Hartkämper and H. Neumann eds. *Lecture Notes in Physics* vol. **29**, Springer Verlag 1974.

[24] S. L. Woronowicz, Positive maps of low dimensional matrix algebras, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **10** (1976), 165–183.

Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Gdańsk University, Wita Stwosza 57, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland, E-mail: fizwam@univ.gda.pl

Institute of Mathematics, Gdańsk University, Wita Stwosza 57, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland, E-mail: matmm@univ.gda.pl